SOCIAL SCIENCES

NATIONAL REVIEW

PUBLIC LIBRARY
SEP 9 1957
DETROIT

20 Cents

September 14, 1957

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

Hoffa: Tragedy of a Tough Guy

GARRY WILLS

Will Germany Keep Adenauer?

NORBERT MUHLEN

For Once, Like Statesmen

AN EDITORIAL

Articles and Reviews by . . . . . L. BRENT BOZELL
ANTHONY LEJEUNE · RUSSELL KIRK · FRANK MEYER
C. DICKERMAN WILLIAMS · WILLMOORE KENDALL

For the Record

Led by Dr. Martin Luther King, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference has made plans to register five million Negro voters in the South. The campaign, which will cost $200,000 and "use all the facilities of the law," may be endorsed by the Vice President.

In answer to Senator Proxmire's assertion that he was elected on the strength of the deep dissatisfaction of Wisconsin's farmers with the policies of the Department of Agriculture, Secretary Ezra Taft Benson pointed out that 1) Wisconsin went Republican in 1956 long after his Department's policies went into effect and 2) since 1956 the farm income of the state has risen. . . . While the Department of Agriculture is idling 28 million acres through the soil bank formula, the Bureau of Reclamation pursues a six-year program designed to reclaim a million acres. . . . The United States has accorded Poland a highly favorable trade status which allows her to buy industrial machinery, and import surplus farm commodities on a barter basis.

Soviet Russia, the newly-returned Canadian delegates to the International Youth Festival report, is wonderful. They were particularly taken by the USSR's culture, industry, agriculture, and "man in the street." . . . An American delegate found that Muscovites did not know of Howard Fast's defection. But his books had disappeared from Moscow's bookshops.

An unofficial Japanese mission will negotiate with Communist China for a $90 million two-way trade agreement, tripling the present rate. . . . It is principally through Japan that products of U.S. technology are being shipped to Red China by firms partly owned by American interests. The Trading With the Enemy Act forbids foreign firms "controlled or owned" by American citizens to export to the mainland. . . . Prime Minister Nobushuke Kishi has indicated that Japan will recognize Communist China, though "under present conditions it would be premature."

On September 22, General Douglas MacArthur's denunciation of the United States' tax structure, prepared for the annual stockholders' meeting of Remington Rand, will be broadcast over the nation-wide radio network of the Manion Forum. Comments on the speech will be made by T. Coleman Andrews and J. Bracken Lee.

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR: Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.

PUBLISHER: William A. Rusher

EDITORS

L. Brent Bozell — James Burnham
John Chamberlain — Whittaker Chambers
Willmoore Kendall — Suzanne La Follette
Frank S. Meyer

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

ASSOCIATES

Maureen L. Buckley — Priscilla L. Buckley
Jonathan Mitchell — Morrie Ryskind

CONTRIBUTORS

C. D. Batchelor, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbot Clark, Forrest Davis, A. Derso, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, John D. Kreuttner, J. B. Matthews, Gerhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver, E. Merrill Root, Freda Utley, Richard M. Weaver, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

London: Anthony Lejeune
Geneva: Wilhelm Roepke — *Madrid*: J. Dervin
Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

ASSISTANT TO THE PUBLISHER: J. P. McFadden

CONTENTS SEPTEMBER 14, 1957 VOL. IV, NO. 10

THE WEEK 219

ARTICLES

Hoffa: Tragedy of a Tough Guy — Garry Wills 225

Will Germany Keep Adenauer? — Norbert Muhlen 231

DEPARTMENTS

For the Record 218
National Trends .....L. Brent Bozell 224
Letter from the Continent — E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn 228
The Liberal Line .....Willmoore Kendall 229
Letter from London .....Anthony Lejeune 230
Principles and Heresies .....Frank S. Meyer 233
From the Academy .....Russell Kirk 234
To the Editor 238

BOOKS IN REVIEW

None So Blind .....L. Brent Bozell 235
What About the Guilty? — C. Dickerman Williams 236
Reviewed in Brief 237

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly, except the second and third weeks in August, by National Weekly, Inc.

Copyrighted 1957 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc.

Second-class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:
211 East 37th St.
New York 16, N. Y.
Telephone: MUrray Hill 2-0941

RATES, Twenty cents a copy, $7.00 a year, $13.00 for two years. Foreign. $9.00 a year; Canada, $8.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

The WEEK

● So it's Outer Mongolia for Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov, hero of the Revolution! We don't know how to say "outer" in Russian, or even whether it's the same word before Mongolia as it is before Darkness; but we suspect the commissar in charge of appropriate assignments for the fallen has a wry sense of the fitness of things, and is prepared to reduce Valhalla to an old ladies' home. Maybe Malenkov, Shepilov and Molotov can take electric power stations, smalltime college faculties, and Outer Mongolia; but can Communism? The great Rubashov, of *Darkness at Noon,* submitted, in the name of his faith, to the executioner; but could he have accepted the role of Chief of Yenisei Boatmen? The Soviet Union may be communizing the world, but at home there is a sure enough bourgeosification of martyrdom going on.

● NATIONAL REVIEW greets with its benevolent approval the growing spirit of bipartisanship, evidenced by Senator Knowland in California and Democratic Senator Lausche in Ohio simultaneously calling for right-to-work laws.

● Concluding its hearings on Communist penetration of the labor movement, acting chairman Roman Hruska of the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee totted up the score: fourteen persons affiliated with the International Union of Electrical Workers, eleven with the United Automobile Workers, six officers of the American Communications Association, four members of the International Association of Machinists, one member of the United Furniture Workers of America took the Fifth Amendment. The subcommittee learned that the Communist Party has, since 1954, been systematically transferring men under its discipline from unions it controls to unions it hopes to control. Senator Hruska, who has done an excellent job on the subcommittee, concludes that the Communist Control Act of 1954 must be amended to "realistically meet the challenge of changing Communist tactics" if the Communist invasion of the "mainstream of American labor" is to be repelled.

● Paul Chabas' "September Morn," which scandalized the Comstock societies when it was shown in an art shop window in 1913, has been installed in the Great Hall of the Metropolitan Museum. The painting is an innocent bit of sentimentality that would hardly do violence to a candy-box cover. But the gal happens to be unclothed (though discreetly shielded by the disposition of her arms, which puts her one up on the Venus de Milo). The temptation was too much for the art editors of the *New York Times* and *Time* Magazine—and for the advertising manager of the S. Klein department store, who used the painting as a jolly come-on to sell clothes. "With age comes respectability," says the avuncular *Times* in a news story under a reproduction of the picture. With age also comes prurience. If you *can't* reproduce those stories about sex in Hollywood as exhibited in the back issues of *Confidential,* there's nothing like utilizing a nice bit of 3.2 nude poster art in their place—especially if what you're doing is merely talking about art!

● The Santa Fe Railroad has reached an impasse in its discussions centering on a compulsory union shop membership agreement with fifteen non-operating unions. The unions want the union shop as modified by the "Atlantic Coast Line formula," which would provide for union membership as a condition of continued employment, with the exception that new employees and old non-members would be "deemed to meet the requirements of the agreement" as long as they pay the union initiation fees, periodic dues and assessments uniformly required of union members. Though objecting to compulsory unionism, Santa Fe management has offered to accept the unions' financial proposal on condition that compulsory initiation fees, dues and assessments shall be "confined to the actual cost of collective bargaining." It would be clearly wrong, says the Santa Fe, to be forced to discharge an employee for failure to pay for expenses attendant upon "political, ideological, fraternal, social or insurance activities" in which a union may engage. In support of its position, the Santa Fe cites recent Texas and Georgia Supreme Court clarifications.

● The head of state in the new nation of Malaya, which has just escaped the British imperialist tyranny to become truly national and native and progressive, will be—you guess—a king. A few relics of ancient Malayan ceremony demanded that His Highness kiss Islam's saber, recite from the Koran, smile at the cameras, and salute the representatives of his fellow monarch, Elizabeth. At least this monarch cannot be accused of having a tweedy court; his herald, according to rite, had to announce the coronation "standing on one leg with the sole of the right foot clamped against the left knee, his right hand shading his eyes, the fingers of his left hand pressing against his left cheek."

● We take leave to mention a new phenomenon in American publishing: ad-burning. The American and the International Councils of Christian Churches,

established evangelical Protestant organizations, planned a rally in Minneapolis at which Dr. Carl McIntyre, a staunch and energetic anti-Communist, was to speak on "Modernism and Communism with Every Christian Contending for the Faith." The Councils prepared a full-page advertisement, urging people to attend. The ad insisted that the danger that Communism poses to the churches is real, and cited relevant testimony before congressional committees by a former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, and a former MVD agent. The *Minneapolis Star* refused to publish the advertisement, an act that goes further to show that respectable auspices are not enough to make anti-Communism respectable.

● India's Prime Minister, Jawaharlal (*pace* Ambassador Gluck) Nehru, set off last week for a tour of disputed Kashmir, on whose predominantly Moslem population large bodies of Indian troops are quartered to enforce the Indian puppet government that Nehru refuses to submit to the free elections repeatedly demanded by the United Nations. Pandit Nehru found the moment of departure an auspicious occasion for remarking to the assembled reporters that, in his opinion, it would be a blow at world peace if the special UN Assembly session now considering the Hungary Report should vote to condemn Soviet intervention in Hungary.

● Reports from several European sources with channels into the Soviet Union claim that the chief political basis of the struggle between Khrushchev and his Party opponents has been a question of external, not domestic, policy. The Khrushchev faction is said to stand in particular for "dynamic" as against cautious moves in the Middle East. The defeat of the Molotov-Malenkov-Kaganovich-Shepilov combine, according to this interpretation, was the necessary political prelude to the stepped-up Soviet push into Syria and Yemen.

● On the Danger of Being Misled by Slogans and Catchwords: "I understand [*President Eisenhower is answering the question why was Kohler beaten in Wisconsin*] that in this election, 60 per cent of the Republicans who voted, or the people who voted, for Senator Wiley, failed to vote for the Republican candidate in this election. This was a drop-off that couldn't be absorbed, and, to my mind, it comes about largely through an exaggeration of the principles and ideas that divide the people that so many of you like to call the Right and Left wings of the Republican Party. I had only a recent meeting with several Senators who are classed, I notice publicly, as right-wingers. They and I had quite a conference on the important questions of the day. We found no place where we were in opposite camps, and we —someone made the observation as we left, whichever wing we all belong to, it was the same one, and was not different ones. Now, I believe that people have allowed themselves to be misled by a lot of slogans and catchwords that really have no validity in our politics."

For Once, Like Statesmen

NATIONAL REVIEW commends President Eisenhower and Secretaries Dulles and Quarles for their handling of the Soviet Missile announcement. They have said just what needed to be said in order to deprive the USSR of any intended "propaganda victory." The Russians, they said, 1) have pretty certainly *not* made a breakthrough in missile development, 2) that even if they have made some minor breakthrough, it has no immediate practical significance, 3) that even if it had immediate practical significance, it could not conceivably affect the existing balance of military power within the foreseeable future, 4) that the United States, which prior to the announcement had reduced the funds allocated to missile projects, sees nothing on the horizon that disposes it to reverse its decision in that sense. The President and his subordinates have spoken calmly, with assurance, in the tones of men, and men, moreover, who know what they are doing. And better still, they have explicated their responses with a logic, clarity, and good sense that may well deprive the Russians of the victory they were really after, a victory in psychological warfare. Our leaders have, in a word, acted for once like statesmen conscious of their responsibilities towards informed public opinion.

The main facts to grasp, as they have emerged from the week's discussion, are these:

1. *The Russian announcement is ambiguous to the point of unintelligibility.* It does not define the target area allegedly hit by the new missile; it does not say what the missile can hit "any target" with.

2. *If—and there are no grounds for asserting the contrary—what is in question is a "testing-vehicle," without a warhead, the announcement points to a time-lag, not a breakthrough, in Russian missile-development.* The U.S. fired ICBM testing-vehicles months ago.

3. *The Russians need an intercontinental, as contrasted with an intermediate-range, vehicle more urgently than we.* Because of our ring of bases around —and close to—the USSR, we can make do, through the foreseeable future, with 1,500-mile missiles.

4. *The missile age is not yet, either developmentally or operationally.* The manned bomber remains the surest vehicle for putting an atomic warhead on

target; when and if missiles become the indicated vehicle, it will take years to produce enough of them to affect the actual conduct of operations.

5. *So long as planes remain the surest vehicles for delivery of atomic warheads, the U.S. has natural advantages.* Our Strategic Air Command has 1,500 bombers, qualitatively superior to Soviet bombers; and thousands of atomic warheads; our bases close to the USSR make these the equivalent of a vastly larger number in Soviet hands. Even without foreign bases, our SAC has and the Soviet long-range Air Force does not have in-flight fueling techniques.

6. *When and if ICBM's become operational, we shall be able to build them faster than the USSR.* Meanwhile, minor differences of pace between their program and ours are of minor importance.

7. *U.S. military planning will continue to be done in Washington, not Moscow.* To place the allocation of funds among alternative lines of military expenditure in the hands of the Soviet propaganda ministry would invite defeat in any future war.

This time, we repeat, we pay tribute to the Administration. With, however, this reservation: If the Administration indeed sees that its military planning must not be placed at the mercy of Soviet announcements, let it apply the same principle to its discourse with the public opinion that placed it in office.

Finally: how can an Administration that can make so much sense about missiles in Washington, tolerate such nonsense about disarmament in London?

Who Makes Our Laws?

Upon the August 30 close of the first session of the 85th Congress, the political chroniclers, sharpening their pencils, quickly totted up its "balance sheet" or "scoreboard." Whether the metaphor is taken from business or sport, there is a generally shared assumption. The record, rating or score of a Congress is to be determined by its batting average on the balls pitched by the President. We list the items on "the President's program." We find that Congress enacted so many, rejecting so many, and forgot about the rest. Ergo, we give Congress a grade of a "constructive" 80 per cent, an "indifferent" 50 per cent, or a shameless "do-nothing" 30 per cent, according to the particular session's performance.

Noting that on this accepted rating scale the first session of the 85th Congress flunked badly, as our political mentors have duly informed us through their columnar bulletins, let us turn our attention to the rating scale itself, and its presuppositions. For there are few plainer marks of the channel of our post-1933 constitutional revolution than this bland assumption that it is Congress' function and duty to enact laws and statutes transmitted to it by the Chief Executive and his agents.

What, indeed, is this "President's program"? You will search for it in vain through the clauses of our Constitution or the practices of the first century and a quarter of our national existence. Our Constitution declares in its very first Article, first sentence, that "All [*repeat,* all] legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress" and only in a Congress. The Executive is directed to give Congress information, from time to time, on the state of the Union, and to recommend "such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

The idea that the President should send to Congress, in elaborated detail, the substance and very text of the statutes that it would be expected to enact was ruled out—so it was assumed—by the very nature of the diffused American governmental system with its separated and balancing powers. For the President to write the laws would transform him into Chief Legislator as well as Chief Executive. The function of Congress would be gradually degraded, in political reality, to that of registering Presidential decrees.

As late as 1908 Senator Henry Cabot Lodge made a famous and long remembered speech indignantly denouncing President Theodore Roosevelt's effrontery in sending Congress, via one of his Cabinet members, the text of a law drawn up in the White House. In 1908 no one had ever heard, or even conceived, of White House "must legislation." Twenty-six years later, Joe Robinson—interpreting the role of "party leader" to mean "White House messenger boy"—was getting Senate majorities for bills so hot off the White House griddle that neither he nor any other member of Congress had seen more than their titles.

The "poor score" on the President's program that all commentators agree the 85th Congress has made in its first session is thus occasion for rejoicing, for those of us who prefer a return to our traditional constitutional system rather than its continuing transformation into a centralized, monolithic statism. By declining to approve some of the program's grosser items—the school subsidy bill, for example—as well as by carefully rewriting most of the accepted White House proposals, Congress gave proof that there is still some political life stirring beneath its badly battered frame.

And we add one further ribbon at this half-way mark of the 85th. Although the statistics are not all compiled, it is clear that this congressional session passed *fewer* laws than any since 1933. What we shall now root for is a 1958 session that—by repealing more laws than it passes—will show a net deficit in law-making. *That* would be a record to write home about!

The Milk of Human Kindness Turns Sour

In the weeks ahead, we predict, with our usual willingness to bet on a dead certainty, there will be a mighty thumping on the biggest drums to distract the American people from their reawakened and legitimate concern over their national safety. The events of the past fortnight will give our opinion leaders many a difficult hour at the bar of public opinion. In Brooklyn an obscure pseudo-artist was discovered to be a Soviet colonel who had for many years directed an espionage ring which doubtless included many Americans whose names are yet undisclosed. In Hollywood, Mr. Morros declared that he had been for many years an American double-agent and that he is now ready to expose another Communist apparatus, which predictably will include yet other Americans. And worst of all, the deeply involved Mr. and Mrs. Alfred K. Stern, who some months ago refused to return to the United States to testify before a grand jury investigating subversion, have appeared behind the Iron Curtain.

The Sterns will probably be the crucial figures. Mr. Stern's record, which may be inspected in *Who's Who*, was virtually a guarantee of respectability. Born into a family of abundant means, he has occupied positions of high responsibility in financial circles in Chicago and New York; he has, moreover, been an active exponent of public housing and other impeccably progressive schemes. Mrs. Stern is the daughter of a celebrated Liberal professor, William Dodd, who taught at one of the nation's most select colleges, Randolph-Macon, and at one of its most esteemed universities, Chicago, and who became the American ambassador to Germany during the crucial years that preceded World War II. She has written and published a number of books, most recently *The Searching Light*, a novel which sets forth with a pathos that wrings the heart the hideous suffering of a university professor who has been asked, by the Philistines who surround him, to swear that he is not a traitor to his country.

For their efforts, the Sterns mobilized Liberal enthusiasms. Theirs was a Love for All Mankind, regardless of faith, color or creed. Even if, it develops, the creed is Communism.

The Sterns swell the ever longer list of men and women conspicuous for their Liberal opinions who were evidently unsuspected by their most trusted and intimate associates of infidelity to our country. Did they start as traitors, and adopt Liberalism as an impenetrable disguise? Or is there something in Liberalism that makes the mind susceptible to the contagion of treason? That question cannot yet be answered. But others that bear on it and on our safety will arise in the next weeks, when the trial of Colonel Abel begins, and it becomes clearer to what extent the traitors among us drew strength from an internal security program rendered increasingly impotent by the dominance of Liberal assumptions.

Which Way the Wind?

Early in June we were told by the Supreme Court that the defense attorney in a criminal case must, prior to trial, be given direct access to secret information in the government's possession (FBI files, for example), and that it is up to him to decide whether this can be used to impeach the credibility of government witnesses. Ever since, the Justice Department, though its chief was of course appointed by the same President who named the justices who laid down the ruling, has been trying to limit its harmfulness by pleading, in actual cases, that the Court could not have intended everything its language seemed to imply—could not, for instance, have meant to make available to defense counsel secret information palpably irrelevant to the witness' testimony. Similarly, defense attorneys all over the land have sought to extend the application of the ruling as much as possible.

The Hoffa case was a victory for the extenders; a recent Virginia case, where counsel was held to be entitled only to a resumé of secret information screened by the presiding judge, seemed a victory for the limiters. And the good old days, when the winds of judicial arbitrariness blew only on Monday afternoons, have seemed in retrospect an age of constitutional stability.

Comes now, however, Federal Judge Bryan, in an income-tax case concerning one Anthony Palermo, to insist that 1) defense counsel's right to inspect government data begins when the prosecution places the opposing witness on the stand, not before, and 2) any other reading of the Supreme Court's intention would give defendants an "undue advantage."

NATIONAL REVIEW hopes that President Eisenhower will sign the newly-enacted so-called FBI bill, which will sharply limit the *Jencks* ruling, assigning to the judge, not to the defense counsel (who may of course be a Communist agent), the first sifting of the file. Meanwhile, however, it welcomes the Palermo-case summons to sanity by an able and courageous jurist.

The Supreme Court may, to be sure, seize an early opportunity to restore "undue advantage"; but also it may learn—or be taught—that in order to be respected it must act respectably. If so, it will uphold the Bryan ruling.

Kreuttner

"We feel that it might be amusing to retain certain portions of it. Some of its phraseology has a quaint merit."

Twistmaul Week

This week is Constitution Week. A good time, then, to remind ourselves that in imperial Rome they kept celebrating the forms of the Republic long after its substance had been eaten away.

Our own speech for Constitution Week would begin by observing that the Tenth Amendment, which reserves all non-enumerated rights and powers to the states and the citizens thereof, has been thoroughly poleaxed by the Supreme Court's decision on integration. It would continue by pointing out that compulsory unionism, as authorized by the amended Railway Labor Act and permitted by the Taft-Hartley Act, is in violation of the Tenth Amendment, the First and the Fifth. It would note further that the General Welfare clause has become a slap-happy hunting ground for every Particular Welfare group in the forty-eight states, not to mention the Particular Welfarists in a baker's dozen of foreign nations.

It would mark that the federal government is guilty of violation of the Thirteenth Amendment (which prohibits involuntary servitude) every time it compels a company to check off a social security payment or an income-tax deduction for an employee. It would observe that the navigability of rivers and the control of floods (the *constitutional* reasons for TVA) are not demonstrably served by the construction of federally-owned steam plants in addition to the power installations which are a natural by-product of big dams. It would express doubt that crop-control laws enacted under the protection of the interstate commerce clause can legitimately be used to penalize a farmer who raises grain on his own acres to feed to his own chickens and pigs.

Our speech would, in short, celebrate the traditional Constitution. But, as we say, we are sticking our oar in where we haven't been asked; though, to be sure, in waters patrolled by men who have little in common with the Founding Fathers.

Erratum: In the February 2, 1957, issue of NATIONAL REVIEW, an editorial noted that the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee paid the Center of International Studies at MIT $200,000 for a study of U.S. foreign policy and further noted that the Center, "according to persistent rumor, was set up and financed for the most part by the Central Intelligence Agency." The editorial took the position that the Center, committed to CIA policies, had no business "putting itself forward as a bona fide scientific outfit" or accepting funds from a Senate Committee for a research job. In respect of the figure named, NATIONAL REVIEW erred: the Center was paid only $8,000. On the rest of the editorial, NATIONAL REVIEW stands.

Our Contributors: NORBERT MUHLEN ("Will Germany Keep Adenauer?") is a foreign correspondent who for the past ten years has practically commuted between Europe and the United States. He is the author of several books, of which the most recent is *The Return of Germany* (Regnery) . . . . GARRY WILLS ("Hoffa: Tragedy of a Tough Guy") will be remembered for his *Time*style (NATIONAL REVIEW, August 3).

NATIONAL TRENDS

L. BRENT BOZELL

Wait Till Next Year: Some Notes on the 85th Congress

Liberal commentators all wrote pretty much the same thing in their post-adjournment wrap-ups: Aside from having passed "significant" civil rights legislation, the 85th was a do-nothing Congress. They hinted or came right out and said, moreover, that this was probably just as well. Their verdict is understandable.

Ever since late January, Washington has felt sure a conservative trend is running in the country. The feeling had little relation to last autumn's election returns: if anything, the voters' overwhelming endorsement of a Liberal President and the election of a Democratic Congress—to say nothing of the pitiful showing by third-party oppositionists—had turned political compasses the other way.

Then came the rumbling from the hinterland—first, over the Executive's arrogation of power in the Eisenhower Doctrine; later, and more ominously, over the size of the budget, and foreign aid. The rumblings were detected by mail—an unprecedented volume of it. And more tellingly, by corroborative on-the-spot reports from the scores of political informants upon whom every Congressman and Senator depends. The bipartisan and domestic policies fostered by the Establishment had never really been popular? All right, but here was an articulate and full-throated protest. Conservative discontent appeared more intent and more widespread than at any time since 1952, possibly since 1946. Worse still, the situation was out of control. The Establishment could count on its propaganda machine to sound a four-bell alarm, and it could make its President, against his wishes, go on television twice. But it couldn't make anyone—either the people or their representatives—listen. And few did.

The implications were plain enough. The question at the time was not, Does the protest sentiment represent marginally decisive opinion in the country, or in a given section of the country?, but, Do members of Congress think it does? They thought it did. And members of Congress have been known to cast their votes in ways calculated to please their constituencies. The Establishment, in a word, was in clear and present danger of losing its shirt.

Yet Congress did not revolt. It gave the President the *carte blanche* he wanted in the Middle East. True, it amended the Mideast Resolution, but far from asserting its own power thereby, as commentators have maintained, for the first time it expressly certified the doctrine of full Executive authority in foreign policy.

The Senate ratified the international atomic treaty without a fight. A national plebiscite might have found 20 per cent in accord.

Congress retained the Soil Bank although the House, responding to former protests early in the session, tried to kill it.

The "economy drive"? Congress cut the budget, it says here, by five billion, or roughly half the amount in prospect last March. But the "five billion" cut was brought off, for the most part, by some hanky-panky on the books, and elimination of obvious padding; few government functions were interfered with. The exception is Arthur Larson's propaganda agency—the slice in the USIA budget represented the high-water mark in congressional independence. Foreign aid was reduced by a billion, but anyone who is tempted to read a conservative victory into this item must acquaint himself with a game Congress and the bureaucrats have been playing at for a great many years now. The Executive Department prepares its budgetary requests with an eye to what Congress is likely to do with them, and scales up its "needs" accordingly; when Congress then goes ahead and does what is expected of it, the bureaucrats are neither surprised nor particularly disappointed. A billion is the figure at which foreign aid cuts in the past years averaged out.

On the most important domestic issue facing the country Congress treaded water. Aside from a sorely defective response to the Jencks case it did nothing to check the aggression of the Supreme Court.

Which is why the Establishment heaved a sigh of relief when Congress adjourned. "If it was a do-nothing Congress," as the *New York Times* put it. "Some of the things it has left undone had better have been left undone."

Still, the conservative reaction of the grass roots counted for something. Congress was not supine—it did not perform, as did its sister branches of the government, as an agent of the Establishment. In general, it held firm against *new* concessions—as witness its attitude toward school aid and the international trade organization. . . . The question is, Why didn't the popular reaction count for more? What prevented a conservative breakthrough when many in Congress were of a mind to kick over the traces?

Part of the answer at least is clear. In its hour of promise, the conservative movement lacked the relevant leadership. No prestigious member of either House stepped forward to organize battle lines and direct a campaign. Senator Knowland was the logical candidate for the role, but he declined it. He preferred to play both ends against the middle—against that day in 1960 when he figures he will have to give an accounting to the Establishment. No doubt Senator Knowland moves from a profound dedication to conservative causes. But his guiding assumption—that these causes will never really prosper until a conservative sits in the White House—is risky.

Meanwhile, evidence of a conservative trend, at least within the Republican Party, keeps rolling in. Senator Proxmire's victory in Wisconsin, for example. Compare the election figures—Kohler 313,000, Proxmire 435,000—against the returns in 1946—McCarthy 620,000, McMurray 380,000; or against those of any other year for that matter. Half of the normal Republican electorate, this year, stayed home. Kohler's platform, Eisenhower Republicanism, was the issue. It didn't appeal.

Hoffa: Tragedy of a Tough Guy

The "tough guy" who helped build the Teamsters into a labor empire is on his way out, says the author, but the empire will remain and its power will be used for ends he cannot even imagine

GARRY WILLS

The American public, brought up on gangster movies, is always anxious to meet the real thing. The Kefauver and McClellan shows were popular in the same way that a Humphrey Bogart show is. The crowd came to see gangsters, and in Jimmy Hoffa they were not disappointed. He has spent his life imitating the Bogarts who imitated the Capones and Costellos. Carrying his cocky little body like James Cagney or Edward G. Robinson, speaking the same "me and my pals" language, hunching his shoulders at a question like a man responds only with his fists, he was a caster's dream come true.

It was pathetic to see this man who has all his life tried to convince others that he is a tough guy despite his five feet four inches, trying at a stroke to destroy the role he had so carefully built up. He appeared on his last morning before the Committee, scared but smiling, ostentatiously carrying his brief case; to a bored press table he moaned about the executive meetings he had been at all night, the work he had done on the Teamster constitution, the further meetings he must attend that evening. To the Committee he kept bringing up the "Constitooshun" he was reworking; re-emphasized his title of vice president; tried with disastrous results to use dignified language. (A beautiful example: Senator Ives, noting the vast power Hoffa would have for good or for evil as Teamster president, asked him what he meant to do about it. "I will live up to both responsibilities," he solemnly assured the Committee.)

Even so blundering an attempt to be legislator, vice president, and business executive is a far cry from the early Jimmy Hoffa, who used his fists, indeed, though never so much as he liked to imply. Jimmy grew up in Detroit and in the Teamsters, two tough societies in the early thirties. He organized his first strike when he was seventeen, was elected head of a local at nineteen, and of the Detroit Teamsters at twenty-one. Something of the boy wonder even now, he was then determined not to be five-four and cherub-faced.

Points of Power

Detroit was, in the thirties, the feared center of the coming revolution, where the Reuthers came and went preaching, picketing, and organizing against the impossible odds of autodom. But Jimmy's heroes of that era were the boys of the Purple Gang, tough guys who could win a truck driver's respect. He did not work with the Reuther brothers, but rather after the pattern of the Dunne brothers in Minneapolis, who formed a Teamsters' tactic that demanded a Jimmy Hoffa for its execution. The Teamsters' Union deals with a scattered and diffused membership; where the Reuthers could organize a stable group of workers in a plant, the Teamsters had to tie all the small owners and operators who roam the highways into a powerful unit (for power is the prime fact and drive of labor's efforts). The Dunnes in Minneapolis met this difficulty by grouping their fluid elements around stable points of power; the qualification of these power-points was stability, not literal status as "teamsters." For instance, they used the teamsters to help railroad workers strike, then reversed the process and bound the truck drivers' protest into a pressure that could tell. This set the pattern for Teamster growth, so that even in the recent hearing, when Hoffa was asked about his union's toilet-seat manufacturers and rosary peddlers, he said "We organize anyone we can."

Another method of binding the fugitive drivers into a net across the highways was to gain control of terminals, then of all trucks working out of them, then of any that came to pick up goods or services in that terminal or that whole city. This method, called "leapfrogging," made it necessary to have all warehousemen, servicers, and salesmen "organized," so that we find the union's constitution claiming rights of jurisdiction over "*all* dairy employees . . . *all* cannery workers."

Dan Tobin, the czar of the Teamsters' Union, fought this new kind of expansion, but without success. He opposed the Minneapolis union's bloody strikes, and wanted the union restricted most literally to truck-drivers. But the Dunne brothers' approach won the new blood, and Tobin found his meager 100,000 of 1933 become a kingdom more vast and pivotal than he had ever imagined. Power once attained in this despotism is rarely overthrown, and Tobin ruled the organization built on a vision not his own.

Even with this program outlined, the Teamsters had to deal with the thousands of individual truckers, cluster them around these power nuclei—a job made difficult not only by the unrooted state of drivers, but by their character. A tough group at any time, in the early thirties the truckers still had many of the prohibition drivers in their ranks, men who, like longshoremen, had a background in hijacking, weighting their loads, sabotaging their rivals. They were a hard group to deal with. To expand Tobin's reign with the Dunnes' tactic, two men were needed, one who understood the mathematics of power and could organize from the

center, and one who could scout the bushes and run men into the net.

The two men appeared; Dave Beck, who has gone the way of Tito's and Mussolini's vanity and become a puffed-up living caricature of himself, but who was the brains behind the organizing of teamsterdom's four conferences, and little Jimmy Hoffa, who could talk the trucker's language with a boy's self-importance and use a man's "persuaders." Together, and needing each other, the two men built an empire. Despite rivalry and the recent demise of Beck as an open power, the organization binds them together even now; each is too committed to the thousand "deals" they have managed together to strike at the other without hurting himself. When Jimmy, ducking and running on his dazed last appearance before the Committee, shifted blame for some acts where no one but Beck must bear it, no recriminations followed. The next day they smiled from the news photographs in their old pose, flabby cheek by firm beaver-jowl.

Unseen Empire

"Jimmy" to all, a man who deals personally with other men, not with charts and graphs, Hoffa has built and wielded his power as the big city boss did. Power and patronage go together; "deals" are sewed up through an intricate network of friendships, favors, and the honor that does exist among thieves. A man in this position must be able to burn a candle at both ends and all along its sides—dealing with the employers, with the members, with the middlemen—the carpetbaggers of labor—who spring up everywhere, with the side-groups who can throw their power to Jimmy whenever he needs it, with all those who come to him for "something special." Time has revealed the tireless Jimmy spinning this wearisome web, owning trucks himself, throwing union welfare funds to shady friends' insurance companies, acting as trustee of rebellious groups in the union, the man who breaks their spirit and leads them back under bridle. He has leapfrogged from one organizational problem to another, cajoling reluctant locals into area agreements that give him power in large units. Piece by piece he gave Beck the parts to be fitted into the jigsaw that now covers the nation. It is unfortunate, even esthetically, that all the labor and maneuvering that went into this huge empire can never be recovered from the darkness where such kingdoms are born; it would be a fascinating story of achievement, a kind of inverted epic, an odd heroism of brains and blackjacks. The untold history whose records never were or are destroyed—Iliad after Iliad played out for the enjoyment of the prince of this world—is only hinted at in the few sordid crimes men have uncovered.

The Teamsters, built on power and still afire to augment it, have not

been frustrated. No other union can safely defy them; the men who deliver goods can support or break at will another group's picket line or strike. It is the Minneapolis story all over. Small truckers, that terribly numerous group whose livelihood depends on three or four employees, are at the mercy of the union's agents. Some activities hinge, as the rum-running business did, on the truckers, and the same methods are applied here (often by the same people) as in prohibition days. These are the slot-machine and pinball concerns made famous in the recent hearings, and the men who are milking this business are not parasites of the union but central to it, good friends of the ever-friendly Jimmy. For Hoffa is still available to his constituency, still one who deals person-to-person, who likes to be liked, especially by the tough guys he has always admired. Even under the greatest pressure before the Senate Committee, he would not name a single name when he spoke of cleaning out the union.

The rise of Hoffa is covered by these impregnable friendships, by the mutual engagements assured from all parties to shady doings, and by the cloak of virtue thrown around a labor leader's use of direct violence. But a sample of these methods—as much as can ever be pinned on the big gangsters, the ones caught only, as Hoffa still may be, for evading the income tax—was uncovered by the House Committee's 1953 Detroit investigation. There the public first saw what kind of deal Hoffa is driven to by his compulsion to "organize." Before this he had been arrested seventeen times, six for brawling; had pleaded *nolo contendere* to an indictment for conspiracy to give one paper company a monopoly and to "organize" grocery stores to do his will. He was put on probation and given a fine, which the union paid. But all these had been limited charges which he admitted and sloughed off.

Tangled World

Before the Committee, however, *connections* were exposed, more important than individual deeds, suggestively extending into the highest echelons of labor and the lowest tiers of the underworld. Hoffa was seen moving through a whole world of extortion, violence, union business, and personal profiteering. His amazing policy of destroying the books at the end of the year was aired; the policy had, naturally enough, been applied only to that local in charge of slot machines, the Teamsters' satellite-business run by William Bufalino, who went to the hospital as soon as the Committee arrived in Detroit. Two women entered the picture, too, on the payrolls of various locals, who turned out to be Hoffa's wife and the wife of his partner Bert Brennan (who shares his office and about five businesses with him), both women hidden under their maiden names. Their payroll status Hoffa tried to explain as a whimsical method one local had of repaying a personal loan; when the amount paid them turned out triple what was supposedly advanced, the loan became, by the natural law of all such explanations, a gift. A truck-rental

company was set up in the wives' names, too, put in ideal circumstances through Hoffa's union power, then sold to Carney Matheson, who had originated the scheme.

The kind of tangled world in which a tough guy makes his way became obvious as Hoffa sat there in Detroit with his lawyer George Fitzgerald defending this phony trucking business set up for Carney Matheson. For Fitzgerald and Matheson had bought into a brewery with Jimmy; Matheson, also a lawyer, was supposedly representing the claims of employers *against* the union! Others close to Hoffa were drawing funds from the union for all kinds of private concerns: Paul Dorfman, once a member of the Capone gang, and his son Allen, shared with Hoffa ownership in an oil company and a girls' camp begun on a "loan" from the union. The shuttling of "loans" back and forth in these circles, all cash, all unrepaid, is impressive even to one who expects such things.

The 1953 hearings should have convinced anyone that Hoffa was not, as he pretended, the tough guy who worked only for the good of the gang. Reinhold Niebuhr's recent statement that Hoffa steals only for the union and not from it is simply absurd. Hoffa, it is true, will not live, and eventually vegetate, in a palace like Beck's; he has probably allowed more pilfering by his lieutenants than he has himself executed. Nevertheless, once one deals in the shade for profit, some amount must seem well earned by the "organizer."

Just a Good Show

The recent hearings extended the scenario of Hoffa's dramatic growth to power, but kept essentially the same cast: Brennan, Matheson, the Dorfmans and Fitzgerald again at his side. A few unfortunately newsworthy names, like that of Johnny Dio, entered with an impact which underlined Jimmy's desire to be "one of the gang." Dio and Hoffa took it on the chin, with gangster loyalty to each other, for their phony New York locals and their tapping of grand jury testimony. But all that was here accomplished was a slightly better-focused picture of Jimmy as a criminal. Tough guys are colorful, and the hearings were a lot of fun; but tough guys have a way of getting things done, and he will probably be elected Teamster president this month. It was a good show, but nothing more. For the Jimmy Hoffa it opposed is nothing more. The important thing about Hoffa is the system which made him, and which will break him, since he has nearly outlived his usefulness.

The Hoffa-turned-respectable who sat and checked off the forty-eight charges, as McClellan read them, like an executive checking over his accounts, knows that he is on the way out. All his heroes are pathetically old, members of the Capone gang or their contemporaries. Even Hoffa's fellow imitators, Cagney and Edward G. Robinson, are through. He has been aping dead men. It is too late for him to learn the new roles of power. Typically, he has begun to imitate other businessmen, not the ideologues—cast in the mold of Reuther—to whom the morrow belongs. The ascetic working schedule and personal habits of Hoffa, a devoted family man who never drinks or smokes, are precisely those of the teetotaler millionaires with their own passion for "organizing." This "labor crusader," like the "captain of industry," makes up for his lack of a real crusade by such devices of pseudo-dedication. Hoffa would now like for some of Hal Gibbons' social-worker aureole to rub off on him, as Gibbons wants the *de facto* power of Hoffa. But Jimmy is a man of one role; having worked at it, he cannot unmake the image, ever. There were those who thought Hoffa too smart to have attempted his bribery of Cheasty; but this is the way of all men who organize too long and too successfully, who begin to think they can organize grand juries and congressional hearings and buy and sell anyone. He is reaching the destined end of the tough guy.

Temporary Monarch

He will probably be elected president, a little while to monarchize and kill with looks. But Meany will be after the Teamsters; and he will finally get them. Hoffa will go as Beck has gone. And no one of his never-deserted friends will miss the tough guy. There was some idealism in the labor movement which did not fear to use this strong-arm man; there is none left in the group which will cynically disown him for their own good name. His fall will not even be dignified by pointing a moral. He will be counted a single gangster, not a product and producer of the power-mentality driving the labor movement no less in its present triumph than in its difficult birth. The organizing will move onto a higher and subtler echelon; the cruder work of this little organizer will be scorned and publicly condemned. Men will take the instrument he forged and use it for ends more vast than he could imagine. Power will mean Hal Gibbons making a government of the union, running hospitals and labor centers (and federal elections), instead of Jimmy Hoffa making it a business, running oil fields and trucking firms and jury trials.

Even such friends of the union as Niebuhr admit that it is a despotism, controlling all the organs for speaking and instruments for acting, disposing of dues and contracts at the leaders' will. He advocates constitutional changes to get rid of the Hoffa element in the union. They never can. The rejected fashioner of power will have his revenge. Americans above all others should know that the complex organism of a society forever bears the mark of its birth. Only a single strange conjunction of interests and desires and ideas could have caused the brilliant compromise which is our governmental system. And the Teamsters' Union, too, is oriented by its birth from power and violence toward further power. The tough guy's power will pass into hands more skillful, and so more dangerous. (Dio recounting on the telephone his fear of an airplane crash points up the fearlessness of Reuther when he was shot. Tough guys are always weak; the man to fear does not boast of his fights, as Jimmy did.) But it does not matter how many respectable pairs of gloves are put on the bare hands that fashioned this vast power-pyramid; the Teamsters' Union will continue to bear the mark of the two men who built it.

(Reprints of this article are available at 15 cents each, 100 for $10.00. Address Department R, NATIONAL REVIEW, *211 East 37th St., New York 16, N.Y.)*

Letter from the Continent

E. v. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN

Labor in Europe Today

Labor unions in Europe and in the United States have many characteristics in common, but they also have many traits which sharply distinguish them from one another. One of these features is ideological: European unions were established on an almost exclusively socialist basis. The non-socialist labor unions were founded as a counterpoise by other ideological groups, among which the Catholic Church plays a leading role.

It is curious that most European unions should be socialist because in a socialist order trade unions lose their meaning. The role of the *Profsoyuzi* in the Soviet Union has shown unequivocally that labor unions in the Red Orbit are nothing but organizations designed to transmit orders from the government. When countries like Britain and Sweden are ruled by a Socialist government the union leaders are faced with a terrific dilemma: they must either kowtow to a government which owns all key industries, and thus betray the workers, or menace the "workers' government" with strikes, slowdowns, and other forms of opposition.

This is the situation in Britain. The Trades Union Congress is notoriously "Laborite," but a substantial minority of the British workers—loyal trade-union members who regularly pay union dues—vote Conservative. They have simply resigned themselves to being a part of a socialist-controlled labor organization.

In Germany, there were traditionally three labor unions: the Socialist, the Christian (predominantly Catholic), and the white-collar union of a national-liberal coloration. The Nazis confiscated the property of all these organizations and forced them into a brown "Labor Front." In 1945 the victorious Allies established, by fiat, a single labor organization, insisting that ideological differences should not be permitted to split labor. (Until 1947 the scurrilous notion that Nazism was the result of a capitalist conspiracy was still eagerly fostered by Marxist émigrés in the English-speaking countries.)

The postwar DGB—*Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund*—was composed of the former members of both the Socialist and the Christian labor unions plus the new generation which had grown up since 1933. But because the officers of the DGB were elected by majority vote, the Christian element took on the character of a tolerated minority. After years of being constantly outvoted, and of seeing the DGB systematically oppose the Adenauer government, some high-spirited German Christian workers showed less patience than that of the conservative minority among the British trade unions: they re-established, in 1956, a Christian Labor Union, the CGD.

Growth of the CDG

It got off to a bad start. Workers have a conservatism all their own which sets great store in remaining loyal to the established union. In the beginning, about 80 per cent of the CGD's members had never had any union affiliations. But then three things happened: the majority of the Saar workers and miners, traditionally Catholic, joined the CGD after the reintegration of the Saar; the elections at Krupp's ended with an amazing victory for the "practically non-existent" CDG; the Catholic German Bishops went all out in favor of the CGD. (They could not take a stand as strong as that of the Dutch Catholic Bishops—who simply forbade their faithful to join Socialist or Calvinist unions—because the charge of "clericalism" is readily raised in Germany.)

In countries like France and Italy, the Communist minority quickly obtained leadership in the old trade unions, and it took some time for the tyrannized majority to secede from the original unions and form others. Here again the Catholic element took the lead.

It would be erroneous to think that the non-Communist-controlled trade unions in Europe have not an aggressiveness of their own. The DGB, for instance, though theoretically neutral, is an organization of undeniably socialist inspiration tied, in many ways, to the German Socialist party. (An Adenauer victory in September would definitely weaken it, while strengthening the CGD). Still, the ideologically "neutral" and the Christian trade unions rarely make financial demands of a purely political nature. They feel more responsible to the commonweal than to the vagaries of their members.

There have been cases when all trade unions have combined to press for gains. The frequency of strikes, however, varies according to countries. There has not been a major strike in Austria since 1945 because the "black-red" unitary union works hand in glove with the "black-red" government coalition. Germany and Switzerland have had exceedingly few strikes. (A big strike in Holstein produced strong public indignation.) Strikes are very rare in Holland and Belgium. Curiously, *there seems today to be no connection between full employment, unemployment and strikes.*

On the continent, the legitimacy of labor organizations has been questioned only by liberals—hardly ever by the Right (conservatives, monarchists, etc.). The practice of putting union labels on goods manufactured by union labor is unknown. Also unknown is the "closed shop," a term which, if mentioned by the press, is used in English. In countries with a variety of trade unions within each industry no "closed shop" would be feasible.

Working conditions in many factories are such that a union seems superfluous. The new German co-operative factories have predominantly non-union labor since there the workers also figure as capitalists —for which they are strongly disliked by all labor unions.

The hook-up between labor unions and organized crime—about which we hear so much from the United States today — is practically non-existent. The reason may simply be that there is very little organized crime in Europe, except in some marginal areas.

The Liberal Line...

WILLMOORE KENDALL

The Crisis and the Remedy

The Liberals hate the discussion process as Catholics hate the black mass—that is, as a flat denial of that which they hold most sacred.

Beginning as long ago as J. S. Mill, who set the pattern of their thought and strategy, Liberals have systematically treated the "exchange" of utterance in society as merely a one-way transmission-belt for their superior wisdom and values. Try to "discuss" with them, to carry them with you in a genuine canvass of a problem, to treat public debate as a give-and-take process in which they, equally with those whom they regard as their opponents, might conceivably learn something—might conceivably change their minds—and they will not even hear you, if for no other reason than because they are talking too loud to hear anything but their own voices. Coax them into a moment's silence, and they still will not hear you: they think they know what you are going to say before you even open your mouth, so that listening would be a waste of time and energy. Prevail on them to listen in spite of that, and even then they will not hear you: their minds are closed, impenetrably closed, to any ideas at variance with their own.

Example

Take, for instance the nearest thing there is to a Liberal "Bible"—Mill's *Essay on Liberty,* which puts itself forward as, precisely, a discussion of the discussion process. The *Essay* is a plea for unrestricted freedom of speech, which Mill as a professional philosopher must have known to be as remote from the discussion process, at one end of the spectrum, as is absolute censorship at the other.

Truth, the *Essay* alleges, is discovered only in situations where all are free to speak, where no ideas—however immoral or false they may be considered—are barred, and where beliefs handed down from the past compete on a footing of complete equality with last evening's most extravagant novelty.

No prior political philosopher, as Mill knew very well, had ever adopted such a position; anyone with a college sophomore's knowledge of Plato and Hobbes and Spinoza and Rousseau can explain to you why such arrangements won't work, and would be undesirable even if they would work. But Mill's procedure was to ignore all that his predecessors had said on the problem, to pretend that the only position alternative to his own is that of the man who opposes the discovery of Truth, and to beat that man over the head with the "argument" (demonstrably not an argument at all): See it my way or plead guilty to the charge of regarding yourself as infallible.

Far from moving discussion of the problem of the proper limits on utterance along toward a solution, then, the *Essay* cut the discussion off entirely: Mill's adepts, like Mill, pay no attention to what the skeptics about free speech are saying, and dispose of them always by name-calling. Like Mill, they refuse to discuss, and win all their arguments by confuting non-existent positions.

Another

Or take Bernard Schwartz, who recently did a piece for the *New York Times Magazine* entitled "Is Criticism of the Court Valid?" Mr. Schwartz is the author of a textbook on constitutional law; the topic in hand falls in the very center of his expertise; his competence—as distinguished from his willingness—to deal with it through the rules of the discussion process may be taken for granted.

But note his procedure:

1. *Insist that your opponents have created a new and alarming situation*: ". . . to our grandfathers and fathers the functioning of the Supreme Court was a sacred mystery of American statesmanship . . . The pendulum has swung all the way to the opposite extreme. Veneration has . . . given way to vituperation."

2. *Explain your opponents' behavior in terms of ignorance*: ". . . there has been all too little comprehension among its extreme critics of the vital role which the court has to play in a constitutional system such as ours."

3. *Don't document your allegations about your opponents; don't, above all, concede any common ground between you and them; either error might trap you into a discussion, and get in the way of your first purpose, which is discrediting them*: "The whole purpose of the Constitution . . . is to establish limits which are not to be transcended by the departments of government. . . . Of what avail would such limitations be, however, if there were [—as my opponents clearly wish there to be—] no legal machinery to enforce them?"

4. *If history gets in your way, distort it*: "A generation ago, the need for the highest court to exercise its role effectively was taken for granted . . . [No] substantial sentiment existed in the country for any real curtailment of the court's powers." *In a word, the great debate about "judicial review" never occurred back in the thirties; it is going on now.* "Those who attack the Supreme Court's recent decisions on the ground that they constitute an unwarranted assumption by the court of primacy over the other branches of government ignore constitutional realities. . . ." *Who does so attack the Court? But I told you not to document.*

5. *Conceal your real objective, which here is that of getting the desegregation decision enforced*: "Proper criticism of a particular decision is an appeal to the intelligence of a future day, when a later decision may correct the error into which the critic believes the court has been betrayed. . . . [It] does not at all challenge the place of the court in our constitutional scheme."

But you see my point: The current critics of the Court, as every reader of this magazine knows, have precisely *not* called for any change in the Court's role in the American system—have precisely *not* done that which

(*Continued on p. 238*)

Letter from London

ANTHONY LEJEUNE

The Chill Winds of Reality

For Britain, as for all other nations of the Western Alliance, the Soviet Union's "political parachute drop" into Syria remains the hottest possible news, although one might not know it from the apparent serenity of officials on both sides of the Atlantic. Russia has at last attained that access to warmer seas for which her strategists have been planning for generations. She is well on the way to encircling Turkey, the one strong link between NATO and the Moslem world. She has driven a spearhead through the West's already battered Middle Eastern flank. She commands vital pipelines. Her bombers are within easy striking distance of British and American bases. Spies and agents can infiltrate from Syria into all the surrounding Arab countries and the Syrian army can be launched at Israel whenever such a move seems desirable. Then it would be only another little jump into Egypt, with plenty of friends on the ground.

The British public tends to look at events in the Middle East with a jaundiced, somewhat ironic, eye. Those commentators who ridiculed the idea of a serious Communist threat have now nothing much to say. The sideshow in Oman produced more technical military discussion than doubt about its rights and wrongs. Such operations demand high speed, people feel, not so much because the action itself has to be settled quickly as in order to prevent the enemies of the West from "rallying world opinion" and outmaneuvering a just cause on the slippery floor of the UN. America's abstention over Oman was less resented because wholly expected.

The fact remains that America has constituted herself the world's champion against Communism and, by the Eisenhower Doctrine, the world's policeman in the Middle East. The world is therefore entitled to hope that America knows what she is doing. It was once said of Hollywood that when you've stripped off all the artificial tinsel, there's always the real tinsel underneath. Britain and France can surely be forgiven for wondering whether, when you've stripped off all the State Department's artificial naiveté, you might not find some real naiveté underneath.

Such cynicism is natural but not helpful. It is more encouraging to think that Syria, like Suez, merely manifests a situation which has been surreptitiously building up for some time. A loaded gun may be a very unpleasant object to see, but on the whole it's better to have it out in the open. Every step toward international realism is in the right direction. Any inducement toward the belated creation of an effective Anglo-American policy in the Middle East has something to be said for it.

For, of course, what has happened in Syria isn't really a surprise. Western intelligence in the Middle East is notoriously bad, but we did know that Syria was dangerously near the brink of a Communist *coup*. The Israelis also knew it and tried vainly to alert the rest of the world. The Eisenhower Doctrine, we are told, does not apply to this type of case, which is exactly why some people were worried about it when it was first enunciated. For the primary weapon of imperial Communism has never been "overt armed aggression" but infiltration, subversion and all the devious mechanics of take-over.

What happened in Syria does seem to have surprised some people; but then, many people in the West were startled by what the Hungarian rising brought to light. Already they are beginning to forget Hungary. In a few months (if the Communists give them time) they will stop worrying about Syria. The frustrating but ever attractive lure of disarmament holds them tight. They would like to believe that there is no cold war. The *Observer* last week conceded that "the Russian road since the death of Stalin has not been, and is not now, a straight path from darkness to light" but besought us to beware of "dogmatism and assertiveness" and to admit that, as we didn't really know what was going on, we couldn't rationally choose our part in the world drama.

This refusal to believe in itself, this reluctance to make clear value judgments between right and wrong, is the great weakness of the Western world. The Communists are less bashful. They know perfectly well what they believe in and they promote it with an unhurried efficiency and a global imagination which we may well envy.

Their general strategy is directed to thrusting downward from the Russo-Chinese heartland. Their current tactics are a façade of reasonableness and respectability. In colonial areas the Communist Parties are ordered to promote nationalism rather than overt Communism, and not to reveal their real purpose until independence has been gained.

There are three immediate target areas. The first is Africa. North Africa is already blazing merrily, and the disciples of freedom and democracy can find small comfort in the way things seem to be going in Ghana so soon after its "liberation." The second target is Southeast Asia. The Communists are making notable progress in Indonesia and the arrest of yet another revolutionary cadre in Singapore shows how easily the heat could be turned on again throughout the whole Malay Peninsula. The third target is South America, the soft underbelly of the United States itself. The election of Dr. Jagan in British Guiana may not provide an immediate Soviet foothold, but it is hardly a soothing event. When he was deposed in 1953, the Government White Paper described him and his wife as "zealots in the cause of Communism." It would be strange if the intervening four years had fundamentally changed their views.

The world scene is comfortless and the West deserves that it should be. Until we learn to plan together with our eyes open and our minds firm we can never really hope to contain an indefatigable enemy; which is why I believe a few fresh blasts from the chilly winds of reality may have something to commend them.

Will Germany Keep Adenauer?

Although under the German system Der Alte might win the election and lose the government, his policy is likely to be continued unchanged

NORBERT MUHLEN

For the third time in the history of their young republic, the West Germans will elect their leadership on September 15. The outcome and the meaning of these elections might seem somewhat confusing to observers in this country, where the party with the strongest plurality wins the contest. The West German system presents a different picture. While there is not much doubt today which party will come out with the strongest plurality, it appears less certain whether this winner will also be pronounced the champion, or, to be more precise, whether the winning party will be chosen to control the country for the next four years.

To form a government in West Germany, an absolute majority in the *Bundestag* parliament is required; and in all free elections since 1871, no single German party—not even the Nazi Party after its rise to power—has ever been able to achieve this goal by itself. Therefore, the relatively strongest party must find allies among the other, smaller parties, to join with them in a "coalition" and to overcome the hurdle of the absolute majority. But if it does not come to terms with its potential partners, the losing party may prove more successful in this game of coalescing, and so form the new government. Who will run Germany tomorrow might well depend on the outcome of this post-electoral poker game as much as on the results of the electoral race itself.

The current contest is being fought mainly between two parties, the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and the Social Democratic Party (SPD). In 1949, they polled together 60 per cent of the total valid vote; in 1953, it was 74 per cent. The Weimar Republic saw 32 different parties in one election race; the trend in the Bonn Republic is toward a two-party system. This is possible because both the CDU and the SPD have successfully widened their appeal to voters of a limited *Weltanschauung*. Both try today to draw a much wider following to their ranks. The CDU, rather than depend like its predecessor on the Catholic vote, now counts among its leaders and voters many Protestants as well as Catholics. Though its following among big businessmen and bankers is almost non-existent, "middle class" people, factory workers and peasants are represented in the SPD now that it has discarded its traditional appeal to "class-conscious proletarians" of Marxist persuasion. Numerous intellectuals, white-collar workers and tradespeople now vote SPD, yet its stronghold still remains the organized urban workers and the very poor.

Father Image

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, of course, dominates and personifies the election to a degree that probably surpasses any "father image" America has chosen in the past two decades. The 82-year-old former Mayor of the city of Cologne—who, only ten years ago, was still little known in his own country, let alone abroad—is not the kind of politician who wins votes by his grin, his wisecracks or his flowery oratory. He stands only on the record of his eight years in power, and the methods and principles with which he hopes to continue this record. The opposition lacks a leader whose personality would impress the voters. How strongly even the SPD is dominated by the shadow of Adenauer was clearly demonstrated by a book of cartoons depicting the SPD leader, Erich Ollenhauer, which his party recently distributed to popularize him: out of 97 cartoons reproduced, Adenauer appears next to Ollenhauer in sixty-five.

Adenauer is so deeply respected (rather than "beloved") by a majority of West Germans because he is deservedly identified with the feeling of security and well-being that has come to them after long periods of chaos. Germans are well aware that Adenauer, assisted by the brilliant and fearless free-enterprise economist, Ludwig Erhard, and the penny-pinching Secretary of the Treasury, Fritz Schaeffer, has filled the nation's pocketbooks—while, less than ten years ago, few Germans owned a pocketbook, let alone something to put in it. And the majority prefer to stick with tested leaders.

"Me Too"

In the election campaign of 1953, when the Social Democratic opposition still attempted to persuade Germans that Adenauer's "economic miracle" was merely a mirage bound to "make the rich richer and the poor, poorer," the voters paid little attention. This time, the Social Democrats have grudgingly accepted the general mood, and thus have banned Socialist programs from their election propaganda. Promising simply a somewhat huger admixture of social justice to things as they are, they have accepted the "me too" attitude which has never yet won an election (as Messrs. Dewey and Stevenson discovered in this country). People are smart enough to prefer the inventor and successful practitioner to the wavering plagiarist who only yesterday advocated the opposite prescription.

With the main domestic issue settled in favor of their CDU adversaries, the SPD had to find other issues on the basis of which it could claim, "It's time for a change." The appeal for change for its own sake—which the SPD tries to propagandize by many posters (showing, for instance, a pretty girl with the legend: "Change your train now!")—is counterbalanced by

the equally primitive CDU appeal "Don't change horses in mid-stream" (which simply discourages change as such, since the party in power always moves somewhere in mid-stream, whether this be mid-prosperity or mid-crisis). With its non-economic domestic issues, the opposition party has aroused little response among most Germans. While the SPD warns that a third term for Adenauer and the CDU would be tantamount to the end of the young German democracy, or that the CDU monopolizes, exploits and perverts Christianity, and that clerical influences are given undue leeway in the German community, only very small minorities, even if they agree, feel strongly enough about these matters to let their votes be influenced.

Scare Appeals

It is in the field of foreign politics that the Social Democrats have tried to find a more promising issue. They try to offer more national security, a greater hope for peace, and a better chance for German reunification. In fact, their election campaign has come to concentrate on scare appeals against "atomic death" and "eternal German division," toward which Adenauer is supposed to be leading his people.

But even scare appeals of this kind —always likely to arouse a certain response among people who still remember painfully the horrors of war —have little chance of being translated into votes unless a reasonably plausible and attractive alternative can be presented. As the German majority sees it, the Social Democrats have failed to produce such an alternative. They have concentrated mainly on denouncing and opposing any and all CDU programs and practices in the international field. While Adenauer closely bound his country to the West, the Socialists submitted a vague kind of neutralism in which Germany would be friends with everybody, from the United States to the Soviet Union. When EDC was still the order of the day, SPD chief Ollenhauer vigorously opposed it, but suggested—in a personal interview with this reporter in the fall of 1953—that he and his party would not be at all opposed to a German defense contribution within the NATO framework. When the government itself was forced to embrace this solution after France had scuttled the EDC plans, the SPD also opposed it with undiminished ferocity and suggested as its new alternative a European Security Pact in which East and West would share.

Its program, if it can be called program, includes the whole range of possibilities of foreign politics represented in its own ranks—from the right wing which has only few areas of serious controversy with CDU politics, to the left wing which actually wants neutrality, to the center which uneasily wavers between both. Yet up to now the Social Democrats have failed to win much popular interest in their proposals. While Adenauer's Western alliance presents a concept

which is clear to almost everybody, the Socialist Security Plan is hard to understand. The German majority—and this includes many Social Democratic rank-and-filers—sees in Adenauer's Western alliance the best way by which the country can acquire a certain measure of power and external security against the almost generally hated Soviets. Germans sense that much of the Socialist alternative does not stem from responsible criticism but from frustrated desire for power; and they expect that, should the Socialists come to power, they would be forced to continue where Adenauer left off, since their majority are as anti-Communist as the next German. In this case again, they prefer the pioneer to the doubtful, half-hearted imitator.

Most Germans also distrust the campaign oratory of all parties which promise them speedy reunification with Soviet-ruled East Germany. More realistic than their politicians, they view reunification as a bigger issue than can be solved by any German party, and as a hope rather than a campaign issue. This reporter found that the problem plays a considerably smaller part in the thinking of West Germans today than their politicians pretend to believe, and than foreign observers tend to take for granted.

The Losers Might Win

Under the two-party system, the CDU would have considerably better chances to form the next government than its opposition party. In West Germany, however, two small parties —the Free Democratic Party, which is a free enterprise, anti-clerical vehicle for groups ranging from left-of-center liberals to right-of-center nationalists, and the League of the Homeless and Disfranchised, primarily a group of refugees from the East—will be given a powerful role completely out of proportion to their numerical voting strength. To form a coalition, they can team up with either party and possibly give it the absolute majority, which holds out paradoxical hope for the losers.

But even in such a case, no profound alteration of West German politics is in the offing. If Adenauer's CDU remains in power, as seems likely today, it will continue its close alliance with the United States and the free West. Yet if, by the unpredictable hazards of coalition arithmetic and intrigues, the SPD were to gain power, the chances are that it would not produce any great changes. Freed from its sterile and often irresponsible oppositional negativism, it would soon be forced to give in to the West German popular feeling that "It's no time for a change." Its foreign policies would soon resemble a blurred carbon copy of the CDU originals. Unless there is a severe economic crisis or new political alignments abroad, West Germany will remain a Western-oriented, anti-totalitarian, anti-nationalist, peace and prosperity minded conservative country for the foreseeable future. Whatever the election results, in West Germany today "It's no time for a change."

Principles and Heresies

FRANK S. MEYER

America: No Imperial Rome

It is hard to think of a European who has ever written about America as it is. In European thought the United States always plays a pat role—hero or villain—designed to promote a moral in whatever intellectual or psychic drama is afoot. Even so great a book as *Democracy in America* distorts the American reality in order that America may play its proper part in Alexis de Tocqueville's magnificent dramatic tragedy upon the theme of democracy in Western civilization.

I am not denying, I would strongly affirm, that America is of the West. I am not proposing the thesis that the United States is wholly new and different. We are so much of the West, so deeply of the West, that it is here that the fate of the West will be decided—*but* in the form we have given to the Western heritage, not on the terms decreed for us.

We have been cast in the role of the lower millstone to the Russian upper millstone; of the technological messiah; of the noble savage regenerating an enfeebled Europe. But most frequently in late years we have been iron, soulless Romans, administrators who come at the late summer of a culture to preserve order and civilized forms when the creative heart has gone out of society. Europeans, who see Europe as the Greece of Western civilization and themselves as late Greeks (mysteriously, through some trick of fate, deprived of energy) grudgingly concede to America energy, but only energy. America can play the role of a fierce or a lovable (depending on the writer's mood) watchdog, guarding the decaying mansion of the West; but that is all.

This "Roman" theory of America is usually connected with one or another of the cyclical views of history, of the kind that in the twentieth century has been powerfully projected by Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee. On the whole, the place of America in these constructions has been only broadly and generally indicated. The architects of these historical systems have seemed content to let the America of their imagination stand as a symbol in their ideological structure, as though they were a little afraid to look too closely at the reality, in case it should fail to conform to the required image.

Recently, however, a young Frenchman, with a head full of Hegelian and Spenglerian ideas, has attempted to come to grips with the American reality and to force it willy-nilly into the Roman image. Some pages from Amaury de Riencourt's *The Coming Caesars* have been published in NATIONAL REVIEW (June 1, 1957); the book itself has been widely and admiringly reviewed.

M. de Riencourt brashly skims over Classical and Western history, picking and choosing bits of fact and pseudo-fact to develop his case: that America is Rome, and Caesarism is its destiny. His manifold historical errors of fact could be ignored, were it not that his pretensions of scholarship, uncritically received, have given prestige to his fundamental thesis.

A small sampling of those errors: *Item.* John Adams was *not* a member of the Virginia dynasty. *Item.* Marbury vs. Madison did *not* "firmly [establish] that the Supreme Court was the one and only interpreter of the Constitution." *Item.* "Jefferson was as much dazzled by the last days of Europe's ancien régime as the Romans were by Periclean Athens." Jefferson was *not* dazzled by the France he saw, he was highly critical of it; no Roman but a semi-civilized tribesman of the Sabine Wars yet existed to look at Periclean Athens.

But these errors, I repeat, would be comparatively unimportant, were it not for the fundamental error that arises from the attempt to make a mechanical parallel between the development of Classical civilization and Western civilization, thus ignoring the essential characteristic of Western civilization: the Christian vision of the innate value of the person and of his freedom under God.

The Roman genius was in truth, in relation to Greece, only an administrative and military one, holding together in dull but orderly existence a world inspired by Greek ideas and insight. America has been something else in its relation to Europe. It has been that place in the West where a political constitution, limiting government and protecting the freedom of the person, has matched the philosophical vision of the West, where an adequate political structure has carried that vision to its highest *political* expression.

America is not, as M. de Riencourt and the school he represents would maintain, the representative of the forces of egalitarianism, massocracy, and Caesarism against the refined and spiritual culture of Europe. As a matter of fact, America has till now resisted those forces more energetically than has Europe. It is Europe that has been the source of the theories of the "general will," of egalitarianism, of socialism — not America. In Europe they are close to their decisive victory; in America the issue is still to be decided.

The same struggle, however, between freedom and tyranny, between a God-like and a worm-like view of man, goes on on both sides of the Atlantic. If the Caesars come, borne on the wave of mediocrity, it will not be because America imposes them upon Europe, but because in neither continent have there been enough men dedicated to truth and freedom to resist them.

George Washington is, in the astigmatic eye of M. de Riencourt, the shaper of America and the prototype of its Caesarism; but it was George Washington who said: "Government, like fire, is a dangerous servant and a fearful master." This is a truth that is a necessary political corollary to the Western and Christian understanding of man's nature. It is one that, unhappily, Europe never understood. America once did, and enough remains of that understanding to give some hope for a future American era of Western culture which will be not Caesarist, but free.

From the Academy

RUSSELL KIRK

Lenin and the Naked Ladies

In the Chicago Loop is a bookshop called Romaine's. When last I passed that way, its windows were adorned with Marilyn Monroe calendars cheek by jowl with the *Collected Works of Lenin.* If you go inside, you find a good many books of all sorts: but Romaine's specialities are party-line Marxism and pornography. For the reader who takes his pornography seriously, Romaine's has case upon case of "Scarce Erotica" behind glass doors; for the neophyte or vulgarian in these studies, however, there is a cozy corner lined with little magazines devoted entirely to Frenchwomen in the altogether. I never have been able to make up my mind whether Romaine's intends to corrupt the politics of pornographers or the morals of Communists.

While I delectated between *Das Kapital* (abridged) and *Justine* (unexpurgated), a man bearing a shiny new brief case entered the shop. He being the Man in the Gray Flannel Suit to a nicety, I watched his progress closely. Was Romaine's enjoying some success in seducing the business community to Stalinism? But no; he went straight to Nudity Nook, and browsed briefly. Having bought his weekly quota, he trotted out of the shop, without even glancing at the back numbers of *Masses and Mainstream.*

Now this conjunction of political totalism and moral license caused me to reflect on certain censorial questions. I am not the first to observe the propinquity of Marx and Monroe. At the hearings of the Senate subcommittee looking into the scope of Soviet activity in the United States, last May 9, this subject came up. Mr. Philip Foner, a partner in Citadel Books and Remainder Books, was brought to testify before the subcommittee, then presided over by Senator Watkins. It appeared that Mr. Foner had long been associated with Communists and Communist schools and publishing-ventures. His firm of Citadel Books had published many Communist authors and quasi-Communist books; it had also published many titles of a sort which Mr. Foner preferred to call "psychiatric discussions of sex." But what is more interesting, Mr. Foner had been (through Remainder Books) a close associate of Samuel Roth, last year sentenced to five years imprisonment for mailing obscene publications; and Mr. Foner had been named in the Roth indictment as a co-conspirator. When questioned concerning this little deal, Mr. Foner took refuge in the Fifth Amendment. Philip Foner is himself an author—the editor, among other things, of the *Collected Works of Thomas Paine.* He also has written lives—from one point of view—of Washington, Lincoln and F.D.R.

The activities of persons like Mr. Foner, and the existence of more than one bookshop like Romaine's, have caused some people to wonder whether the Lenin-Fifi juxtaposition is wholly coincidental. It has been suggested in *Counterattack* and elsewhere that the proven Communist traffic in Asiatic narcotics may be paralleled by an equally subtle traffic in pornography. One way to wean the People from their old opiate religion may be to provide them with the new opiate of smut; or, perhaps, it may be found convenient to demonstrate capitalistic states morally decadent by providing them with the paraphernalia of decadence. A case can be made.

Yet that case is not easy to prove beyond a reasonable doubt. For one thing, the orthodox, hard-core Communist bookshop does not traffic at all in pornography. Another favorite resort of mine in Chicago is the Modern Bookshop, situated in decent obscurity high up in a Loop office-building. The Modern Bookshop is austerely sober; nothing that isn't a dedicated crimson is permitted to soil the neat shelves. Every Communist book, pamphlet and magazine in print seems to be kept in stock, and I was flattered to find one of my own works conspicuously displayed, my long essay *The Death of Art*—though only, I fear, because it is bound up in the same covers with Ehrenburg's *Thaw.* There is no conservatively-inclined bookshop in all this country so systematically and thoroughly devoted to a cause. This little shop, indeed, is almost a museum-piece, a survival from the happy days of the Popular Front. Nowhere did Sex rear its coy head.

The Modern Bookshop and Romaine's come straight out of the pages of *1984*: the Modern established for Party members, Romaine's for the proles. The Party, in its fashion, is all things to all men. Whether the Party—as in *1984*—maintains a special bureau to produce pornographic publications, I cannot say; I doubt it, however. Almost certainly it is cheaper to purchase wholesale on the free market and retail profitably the mass-production smut of Old Devil Free Enterprise. And whatever the antecedents and intentions of Mr. Foner and Mr. Roth, I am assured on good authority that the great majority of American pornographic publishers are fine upstanding 100 per cent Americans, dedicated to the preservation of the most rugged individualism. The Soviets had best stick to producing jets, at which they are said to do very well; we can undersell and outproduce them ten times over when it comes to dirty magazines. And our product is much slicker than theirs. *Confidential* has shouldered its way up past the *Saturday Evening Post's* newsstand circulation; and *Playboy,* with its two-score imitators, provides every pimply young American with the glossiest impudicity for a mere fifty cents. Don't tell us that free enterprise is doomed by the resolution of thesis and antithesis; for we've developed the sure-combustion formula for cheap and easy lubricity. That formula is three bosoms bared to the moon, two pages of hoary dirty jokes, one old Somerset Maugham story, and one new Nelson Algren story. And call the magazine *All-American Fun.* Let the Russians have their new tanks; we've got five-color pictures of undressed trollops.

(To be continued)

BOOKS IN REVIEW

None So Blind . . .

L. BRENT BOZELL

Herbert Feis' new book, a minute chronology of Big Three diplomacy during World War II, is getting even gaudier notices than his last two[1]. Mr. Adolf Berle, Jr. commented typically in the *New York Times*, "No better history of the great coalition is likely to be written until the Russian records become available." If good history is nothing more than faithful reportage, we can agree: *Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin* (Princeton, $6.95) is as extensive and accurate a compilation of the high level correspondence and conversations between the major allies from Hitler's invasion of Russia to V-E Day as one would want.

But good history, as Mr. Berle hints he knows, is more than facts: "[Feis] permits himself," he gently remonstrates later on in his review, "all too few verdicts." He does, indeed—to which I would add Mr. Berle permits himself all too few suggestions as to what those verdicts might be. Is it not time now—since the relevant data concerning the Big Three's conduct of the war are in—for Liberal critics like Mr. Berle, as well as Liberal historians like Mr. Feis, to start telling us what they mean?

For several years following the war, the debate over the quality of Roosevelt's and Churchill's wartime leadership was at a near-impasse. Court historians blamed "the lost peace" on a dramatic post-Yalta switch in Soviet attitude and tactics which the West could have parried, they contended, only with the benefit of hindsight. Critics of the court said the nature and history of Communism was such that Soviet policy could and would have been anticipated by anyone but dolts or traitors. And there you were. Little by little, however, evidence began to come in of how the Soviets behaved *during the war*, in full view of Roosevelt and Churchill and their diplomatic staffs.

Mr. Feis has had to deal with this material. While he has avoided conclusions, we may draw them. The impasse, as his book demonstrates, has been broken: from beginning to end, it is a tale of how Soviet machinations, double-dealing, and intransigent self-aggrandizement were met by informed indifference and conscious appeasement on the part of the West.

Stalin bared his fangs only after Yalta?

In the summer of 1941, when Roosevelt and Churchill thought the main question for Russia was whether it could survive the next few weeks, Stalin was insisting on recognition of the Kremlin's 1939-40 territorial grabs in Poland, Rumania and Finland as the price of an Anglo-Soviet treaty.

In April 1943 the Soviets broke relations with Poland over the request by the London government-in-exile for a Red Cross investigation of the Katyn massacre; thereafter, Stalin's terms for reconciliation were incorporation in the London government of pro-Soviet elements, and surrender by Poland of half her territory. In July 1944 Stalin established a puppet group of Communist Poles, which he then proceeded to recognize as the Polish government. The following month he killed off the last important opposition in Poland by halting the Red Army before Warsaw while the Germans crushed the Bor uprising.

From 1941 on Stalin sponsored a revolutionary movement in Yugoslavia that made war against the duly constituted Yugoslav government and the forces fighting under its Minister of War, Draza Mihailovitch.

In September 1944, though Molotov had publicly promised the month before to let the Rumanian Army keep its arms and join the war against Hitler, the Red Army proceeded to disarm the Rumanians and treat the country as a conquered province. The same month, while the British and American governments were arranging armistice terms with the Bulgarian government (with which they alone were at war) the Soviet Union abruptly declared war on Bulgaria, occupied the country and proceeded to rule it.

In all of this, Roosevelt passively, and Churchill with occasional protests, acquiesced. For Europe, Feis' material shows, Yalta was a ratifying convention.

Feis' material also makes trouble for the Establishment's version of what happened at Yalta as regards the Far East; namely that in exchange for ceding Chinese territory to Stalin, Roosevelt got Stalin's promise to fight Japan. Actually, Stalin had unequivocally told Hull in Moscow, in October 1943, that Russia would enter the Japanese war as soon as Germany was defeated. No rewards were asked or offered. Stalin repeated his intentions to Roosevelt at Teheran in November.

Thus Stalin, throughout the conflict, acted upon Clausewitz' dictum that war is a continuation of politics. Soviet "war aims" were consistently and observably to consolidate, and to expand as far as its means would permit, Communist political power. And what were the war aims of the Western powers? *To win the war.* That is just about all there was to it; and that, of course, is not a war *aim* at all.

Roosevelt had two ideas, Feis shows —and really only two—that might qualify as war aims. He wanted to carve up the British Empire—to consign "dependent peoples" to international trusteeships in which the Soviets would, of course, have a hand.

[1] *The Road to Pearl Harbor* (1950); *The China Tangle* (1953).

And he hoped to guard the peace (against whom? one might ask) by a condominium of the Great Powers. With the sheer power relationship of a real world, Roosevelt showed no concern whatever.

Churchill always flew closer to earth than his American comrades, but seldom took advantage of his clearer view. While it is true that he frequently urged military ventures in Eastern Europe, he did not, as I think Mr. Feis conclusively proves, have political objectives in mind—at least not until the summer of 1944. Only after Yalta did he really come to his senses—and to grips with the Soviet challenge. Then, too late, he urged that allied armies plunge into Middle Europe, that they meet the Russians as far to the East as possible. It was too late because, with Berlin and Prague in his grasp, and possessing sole authority to determine the limits of the Western advance, Eisenhower —without opposition from the American government and to the great consternation of Churchill and the British military staff—ordered his armies to halt.

Let us suggest a broad verdict. To fight a war for the sheer purpose of winning it is immoral. One must not will human death and suffering except as a means for bringing about better conditions of life following the event than those that preceded it. America went to war, presumably, because we deemed domination of the European and Asian continents by hostile and predatory powers a threat to our national security. Therefore, to have waged that war in such manner as to insure the emergence of another hostile and predatory power in the place of our defeated enemies—and a more dangerous power at that (if only for the reason that unlike Japan or Germany, Russia would have no potential competitor on either continent)—was foolishness to the point of knavery.

Roosevelt's conduct invites a sinister interpretation. Still, the likely explanation is that this vain and frivolous man was in this, as in so many things, a child of darkness—that for all his pretensions and flair and style, Roosevelt's grasp of international politics was in a class with his understanding of the monetary system.

With Churchill, preoccupation with the current enemy was more understandable in the light of Britain's brush with death at Hitler's hands. On the other hand, the excuse of ignorance is not available to Churchill. Because he clearly understood Soviet Communism—had he not been lecturing the world about it for years?—he perhaps should be judged more harshly than Roosevelt.

Mr. Feis, withal, has written a book in which Roosevelt and Churchill emerge as great men who led their nations greatly. How does he do it?—the device is important to note because it is the court historian's last line of defense. On the heels of nearly every account of a major surrender to Stalin, you will find some variant of the following: "Roosevelt and Churchill felt they had to bow, or risk the collapse of the coalition." The remark is highly tendentious: Feis means you to infer that any reasonable man at the time would have felt Stalin's good will was necessary a) to win the peace, b) to keep Russia in the war. The short answers are a) that Stalin's good will, however desirable, was observably unavailable, and would predictably become less available with Hitler's defeat; b) not a scrap of evidence exists (Feis, at one point, admits this) that Stalin would or could have made a separate peace.

The West, on the other hand, probably could have had peace with Germany at any time from 1943 on, and on terms that would have unhorsed the Nazi regime while leaving an effective counterpoise to Soviet power in Europe. This was the missed opportunity. By failing to encourage that development—indeed, by deliberately forbidding it—Roosevelt and Churchill lost a far greater battle than they won.

What About the Guilty?

C. DICKERMAN WILLIAMS

The administration of criminal justice is in the hands of human beings; hence errors occur, and despite the extreme safeguards provided by American law innocent men are occasionally convicted. In *Not Guilty* (Doubleday, $3.75) the late Judge Jerome Frank and his daughter Barbara describe thirty-six actual cases. Eighteen of these are set forth in some detail; eighteen others are summarized too briefly to be meaningful. In a concluding chapter Judge Frank comments on the weaknesses of judicial trials.

As the authors have chosen cases in which the authorities subsequently recognized the innocence of the convicted men, the impression given may be false. That impression is that these miscarriages of justice are due to fantastic combinations of circumstances which would baffle any legal system. The falsely accused man usually bears a striking resemblance to the true culprit, was in the general vicinity of the crime when it took place, and for some reason is unable to account persuasively for what he was doing at the time.

But judges, prosecutors and the public are willing to listen to a convict who insists upon his innocence; the real offender is disposed either to confess or to repeat the crime in some characteristic way that by inference clears the innocent man, by this time in prison and therefore having an impregnable alibi. And frequently the state, although under no legal obligation to do so, grants compensation. Undoubtedly, however, there are other cases in which the truth did not come out. In any event the conviction of an innocent man is a horrible affair and society should take all possible means to prevent it.

Judge Frank's summing up seems primarily devoted to showing that all judicial fact-finding is likely to be wrong. Witnesses forget, jurors are inattentive, lawyers are tricky. Nevertheless Judge Frank asserts explicitly that "on the whole our system works fairly" and "justly." His only specific suggestion for improved procedures is to carry into criminal jurisprudence the system of "discovery" increasingly used in recent years in civil litigation. Through "discovery" litigants examine the papers and witnesses of the other side in advance of trial. To the argu-

ment that discovery in criminal cases would conflict with the Fifth Amendment, Judge Frank answers that discovery of the prosecution's case might be made available only to defendants who waive their privilege against self-incrimination. Judge Frank took for granted that legislation would be necessary to implement his proposal. As a lawyer who has been active in both criminal and civil litigation I agree that, conditioned on such a waiver and in other respects, discovery procedures might be most helpful in criminal cases.

Curiously enough the Supreme Court by its decision in the *Jencks* case has provided, in substance, a considerable measure of discovery to defendants in criminal cases—*without legislation and without requiring the waiver of the Fifth Amendment* that Judge Frank thought to be in order as a *quid pro quo*.

Plainly society should take every precaution to avoid convicting the innocent. One cannot but think, however, that the attention of able and socially responsible minds should also be devoted to convicting the guilty. The crime rate steadily mounts. The number of unsolved murders, robberies and assaults increases yearly. Organized gangs of criminals levy tribute on small business in major cities. In recent years the intelligentsia has made little contribution —none, so far as I am aware—to the solution of this problem; indeed they seem to be oblivious to its existence.

REVIEWED IN BRIEF

THE INTERPLAY OF EAST AND WEST, by Barbara Ward (Norton, $3.50). Economist Ward suggests we save Asia from Communism by supporting an industrialization of Japan and India to compete with China's advances. But cynically to buy cynical men like Nehru is not to win them; it is necessary to compete with Communism on a level deeper than that of competitive bidding. Miss Ward's second proposal is that we establish a world court and police force to eliminate economic clashes. How can we, first of all, eliminate political and cultural clashes in order to set up a court? Miss Ward simply bids us blunder through. Dangerous advice, since court and law are the outgrowth, not the source, of human harmony. G. W.

THE ROAD TO SANTIAGO: PILGRIMS OF ST. JAMES, by Walter Starkie (Dutton, $5.95). Scholar, fiddler, gentleman errant, and above all a man of unstandardized soul, Walter Starkie believes the thing we need most is privacy: "The greatest reformer of today will be the man who founds a League of Silence." His own solution, during 1954, was a good long walk from Arles, in southern France, to Santiago, on the northwest coast of Spain, where according to tradition the mortal relics of the Apostle St. James have reposed for 1900 years, and where pilgrims have been coming in homage since the ninth century. Mr. Starkie fiddled for his dinner, listened to tall tales, slept in haunted hostelries, and most of the time just walked along, unfeverishly communing with himself and the landscape. A book for readers wondering how to survive—not the Dark, but the Fluorescent-Lighted Ages. R. P.

THE THING DESIRED, by Lalage Pulvertaft (Viking, $3.50). A potpourri of egomania, mental illness, sensual desire, and general confusion. If it is representative of "the best of the new generation of English writers," as the publisher claims, England would do well to remember and cherish her past. Galsworthy and Kipling were not amateur psychiatrists, nor guilty of such lines as "Don't let's be so serious, shall us?"

FABLE, FACT AND HISTORY, by Willis Thornton (Greenberg, $4.50). This is an entertaining collection of pseudo-historical myths and impostures, ranging from Samuel Adams' story of the Boston "Massacre" in 1770, which was used to whip up anti-British feeling among credulous colonists, to the exploits of Vrain-Lucas, who in the middle of the last century made a living by selling to distinguished Frenchmen such treasures as an autograph letter written in sixteenth-century French on rag paper by Sappho. But a man who writes about errors and frauds is under a particular obligation to show some competence as an historian. Even if he is excused from doing research on his own, such as would quickly have shown him that the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" are largely derived from the thirty-ninth chapter of Francisco de Quevedo's *Hora de Todos* (1639), he has no right to discuss, for example, the Kensington rune stone while he is completely ignorant of the linguistic evidence published by S. N. Hagen in the issue of *Speculum* for July 1950. R. P. O.

COME WITH ME TO MACEDONIA, by Leonard Drohan (Knopf, $3.95). "*What* a novel!" cries the jacket, and on the blurb Mr. Knopf himself declares, "I cannot remember when I have laughed so much." The author's intention, apparently, was satire—the affectionate sort—and heaven knows, his subject (office life in the government bureaucracy) is waiting for a white knight. But Leonard Drohan is not his name. His inepitude, in fact, is so thorough, so unflawed, so flatly jejeune, that a few bits are almost worth reading for themselves. Page 35: "There was no question about it, Georgina was all woman . . ." Page 36: "Sometimes, in moments like this, Humphrey wondered how his life was going to turn out." There are 344 pages. R. B.

To order any book reviewed in this book section, write:

THE BOOKMAILER
Box 101, Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N. Y.

Return mail service—postpaid
PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

$.....payment enclosed
Please send me: .....
(name of book)
.....
.....
Name .....
Address .....
.....
(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment MUST accompany order. N.Y. City residents add 3% tax.)

To the Editor

Investing in Liberal Arts

May I correct one point in Mr. Russell Kirk's review of my *Education as an Industry* ["From the Academy," August 31], which otherwise gratifies and flatters me beyond my deserts? My proposal to have colleges invest in their students, and to have them repay as alumni is not likely to lead to neglect of liberal studies. Much of the subsidization needed by the liberal arts colleges is now absorbed by the professional colleges. If these were financed according to my proposals, liberal arts colleges could count on more generous endowments—and they could select better students and provide them with more instruction. (Whether they would, is another question into which I could not go as deeply as Mr. Kirk —and I—think necessary.)

New York City ERNEST VAN DEN HAAG

Mr. Chambers

We whooped with joy and gratitude at the announcement that Mr. Whittaker Chambers has joined your editorial staff. That is splendid news.

New York City KATHERINE CROFTON

Nothing you have done since the magnificent original team was assembled promises such fruitful results as getting Whittaker Chambers in the lineup.

Redondo Beach, Cal. JOHN C. ROBB

My congratulations go to you for employing Whittaker Chambers on the staff of your magazine. . . . He is my example of the "True Believer."

Houston, Tex. BEVERLY BOND

NR and the Jury System

After reading "K.O. for Joe Louis" [August 24], I conclude that NATIONAL REVIEW will continue to write stories about labor leaders based on no information at all or on misinformation. Its reporting in such cases will continue to be sloppy, such as placing six Negroes on the Hoffa trial jury when there were eight. And such as referring to Mr. Williams' "cunning" in getting "six Negro jurors on the Hoffa panel," when in federal courts juries are selected by the judge presiding; and, further, by ignoring the obvious fact that juries generally are composed of Whites and Negroes in proportion to the local population. . . .

NR will continue to admire juries which acquit "good guys" like Hughes of Rauh-Friendly notoriety but will castigate juries which acquit "bad guys" like Hoffa. . . .

Mineola, N.Y. JAMES G. BLAKE

[*NR will continue to believe that though Hughes was technically guilty, he should have been let off; and that though Hoffa was acquitted, he was guilty, and should have been punished. And if that is too complicated, so is the world about which NR writes, and over which, alas, NR has little control.* ED.]

No Incentive for Teachers

Russell Kirk in his review of *Why Teach?* [August 31] . . . gets to the heart of the problem when he says that "too many teachers drop out of the profession altogether in despair of ever being allowed to teach. . . ."

The present educational set-up . . . is also responsible for many of the brighter college students giving up any ideas of teaching as a profession. I have seen too many of my fellow students, who had planned to become teachers, change those plans after being forced through a year of introductory courses in how to erase blackboards and arrange desks.

Another aspect to consider: True teaching, among the professions, is unique in that it is the most pure form by which one person can impart his knowledge to others, the students. . . . When teaching is made simply an administrative duty, no different basically from the other professions, why shouldn't he choose the field with the highest monetary reward? Under such conditions, it is only natural that many of those who *do* become teachers, will do so because they were not able to succeed in the higher-paying professions.

Washington, D.C. DAVID FRANKE

Dr. Graham's Collaborators

In NATIONAL REVIEW of August 24 a lady took issue with Mr. Schlamm's recent article on Billy Graham. She pointed out that "a portion of" those attending the Graham meetings would "find homes in comfortable, even air-conditioned churches." We should not be too quick to assume that a person's spiritual welfare is being taken care of just because he gets into a church building.

Many Bible-believing Protestants take serious issue with Dr. Graham's meetings mainly because of his cooperation with so-called clergymen who have departed far from the fundamentals of the Protestant faith, some of whom are out-and-out Communist collaborators and fellow travelers. . . .

Towson, Pa. JULIAN E. WILLIAMS

THE LIBERAL LINE

(*Continued from p. 229*)

the Liberal critics of the thirties never hesitated to do. Mr. Schwartz's opponents are with him, not against him, on what he pretends to regard as the central issue, for no current critic of the Court has pled for unlimited government. The critics' point has been, all along, that the Court's worst enemy is itself—that, as Mr. Schwartz himself says, "there can be no Constitution without law administered through the highest court, [but] this necessarily presupposes respect for . . . the law declared by the court," *but* that, and this is the main issue, the issue Mr. Schwartz refuses to discuss, respect for the law declared by the court presupposes a court deserving of respect, and willing to mend its ways when it finds it is losing it. That, in a word, the remedy in the present constitutional crisis lies in the court developing a little respect for the wisdom of its predecessors. And in Mr. Schwartz, and his Liberal friends, developing a little respect for the discussion process.

Paid Advertisement

To Correct Some Misinformation

On May 20 last I wrote to the *New York Times* and suggested some corrections of misinformation the *Times* had given its readers May 18 regarding the village of Manorville, Long Island. On June 21, after two requests for a reply, a letter arrived from Assistant Managing Editor Garst; the May 20 letter, he said, "apparently has been lost." On June 25 a copy of the May 20 letter was sent Mr. Garst. On July 19, after two requests for a reply, a letter arrived from Mr. Garst. In it he came to the conclusion "that it was the tone of the story, rather than any great disparity in the facts. . . which seems to have disturbed you. Obviously, we tried to give atmosphere rather than a detailed inventory of what the place consisted of."

Unhappily, Mr. Garst's "tone" and "atmosphere" are as incorrect as his "facts." "The *Times*" Mr. Garst added, "might take another look at Manorville sometime when it warrants news coverage" and give another description of it. Until that "sometime" arrives, if ever, perhaps the misinformed readers of the *Times* would like to know how the *Times'* "atmosphere" fits the facts.

The following is the *Times* story of May 18:

Manorville Is So Small It Really Is Not a Town

"MANORVILLE, L.I., May 17—This community has been on the map of Long Island for many years, but it took a stroke of drama to put it on the front pages. Had it not been for the accident that befell 7-year-old Benjamin Hooper, Manorville might have continued unnoticed.

"There really is no town of Manorville. A railroad station — an old wooden shack—a bar and grill, a small general store and a service station strung along a winding country road make up the community. Scattered houses provide a population of 200 at most.

"In other days, Manorville was an important agricultural center. Now the land is marginal and can grow only strawberries and cranberries. The working population finds jobs in the Grumman and other aviation factories in this part of Long Island or in the Brookhaven National Laboratory that adjoins the community. Others manage a precarious livelihood from the worn-out soil."

The Facts

1. Overlooked were the people who live in Manorville and the many who visit it. What the *Times* probably meant to say was Manorville might have continued unnoticed by the *Times*.

2. Instead of 200, the population is over 1,400. Instead of a winding road, there are over twenty roads, all hard-topped and in A-1 condition. There are two service stations, and another, temporarily closed. Instead of a general store, there are two. Besides the bar and grill, there are, if the bar isn't requisite, two other public eating places. Instead of an old wooden shack, the station is a concrete shelter. As to Manorville being "really not a town," it is a village. But why find fault with Manorville just because the *Times* couldn't tell a village from a town?

The community makeup (no mention was made that it wasn't a "detailed inventory") excluded: three churches, all well attended; two public schools, and there are two other school buildings ready to serve the steadily growing population; a new Post Office, and a new Fire House, which also serves as the village meeting hall. Both facilities are as up-to-date and efficient in their services as are any of their counterparts in New York City.

3. Having mentioned the public and quasi-public plants in the adjoining communities which afford employment (for which we are thankful) the *Times* omitted mention of the privately operated industries in Manorville which also afford employment (and for which we are equally thankful). Besides, the free enterprise firms help with the tax load.

Instead of the land being able to grow "only strawberries and cranberries," the truth is cranberries are a relatively, and strawberries an infinitesimally, small part of Manorville produce, which consists mainly of potatoes, cauliflower, beans, tomatoes, cucumbers, cabbage, corn, rye and poultry and eggs. And Manorville's importance in the old days was due not so much to its being an agricultural center as to its being a railroad junction point connecting the main line with the south shore line at Eastport. The connecting tracks were removed by the railroad company ten years ago. Manorville today is as much an agricultural center, if not more so, as it was in those days (when lumber and cordwood were main crops).

More land is cleared now and clearing continues steadily. Rising demand for residential and industrial sites, increasing land values and taxation may tend to render the land uneconomical for farming, but this land is no more "marginal" than is the land around Times Square. Nor is the fallow, virginal land or the newly cleared land or the uncleared land "worn-out soil."

Right across the road from the place where little Benjamin Hooper had his accident, could be viewed some Manorville land in production: the myriad rows, side by side for nearly a mile and a half, of young plants, fresh and verdant in the rich, dark loam of well managed, fully equipped farms. Clearly visible from this road were upward of 500 acres of gently rolling fields, recently tilled and under full cultivation. But all this lush verdure of Manorville at springtime was destined, alas, to remain unnoticed by the *Times;* it simply didn't harmonize with the theme of Tobacco Road.

The dramatic rescue of the Hooper boy was a story that thrilled the world. It didn't need the *Times'* heavily slanted misrepresentation of this thriving, energetic American community.

The *New York Times* advertises by radio every hour, every day, that its readers are kept "fully informed." Were the readers of the above story "informed" or misinformed by the "atmosphere" and news-slanting of the *Times*?

WM. J. B. MCLAUGHLIN, Manorville, L.I.